

### Remarks

Claims 1-13, 15-17, and 20-41, 43-57, and 61-85 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 20-21, 25, 27, 34-35, 40, 44, 47, 54, 56-57, and 64 have been amended. Claim 42 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment.

### Priority

The examiner states that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the PCT application. A certified copy of the PCT application will be separately filed for delivery by the US Postal Service. Applicant requests domestic priority under 35 USC 365(c) and 35 USC 120 extending to include the provisional application.

### Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claim 1-13, 15-17, 20-57, and 61-85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witham in view of Monks and Meslif. Claim 64, as amended includes the limit:

a single dual function valve wherein both said first electronically controlled mechanism and said second electronically controlled mechanism are within said single dual function valve.

Witham provides valve 32 and solenoid 44. There is no teaching or suggestion in Whitham to combine the functions in a single dual function valve. Whitham teaches providing some burners with solenoid 44 (controlled by knobs 24 and 26) and some burners not (controlled by knobs 28 and 30). Whitham illustrates this with dotted line 38 that includes solenoid 44 and dotted line 40 that excludes solenoid 44. Thus, Whitham teaches against combining the function of solenoid 44 with the function of gas valve 32. Claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended to include similar limits. None of the other references teach or suggest this limit. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 13, 25, and 64, and claims dependent thereon has been traversed.


### Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and the patents in the English language are not believed to be more relevant than those relied upon. The patent German is also not believed to be more relevant than those relied upon but applicant's attorney acknowledges less certainty because of the language.

### Conclusion

It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration. If there are any questions please call applicant's attorney at 802 864-1575.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James M. Leas  
Attorney at Law  
Registration Number 34,372  
802 864-1575

Law Office of James M. Leas  
37 Butler Drive  
S. Burlington, Vermont 05403